arXiv:1211.0328v1 [math.CO] 1 Nov 2012

Some lower bounds for the intersection dimension of graphs

Zeinab Maleki and Behnaz Omoomi

Department of Mathematical Sciences
Isfahan University of Technology
84156-83111, Isfahan, Iran

Abstract

The intersection dimension of a graph with respect to a set of non-negative integers L is the small number l for which there is an assignment on the vertices to subsets $A_v \subseteq \{1, \dots, l\}$, such that every two vertices u, v are adjacent if and only if $|A_u \cap A_v| \in L$. The bipartite intersection dimension is defined similarly when the conditions are considered only for the vertices in different parts. In this paper, some lower bounds for the (bipartite) intersection dimension of a graph with respect to various types L in terms of the minimum rank of graph are obtained.

Keywords: Set intersection representation; Intersection dimension; Bipartite set intersection representation; Bipartite intersection dimension.

1 Introduction

A *graph representation* is an assignment on the vertices of graph to a family of objects satisfying certain conditions and a rule which determines from the objects whether or not two vertices are adjacent. In the literature, different types of graph representations such as the set intersection representation [4, 9] and the vector representation [11, 12, 13] are studied.

The *set intersection representation* is one of the basic graph representations, which is an assignment of sets to the vertices such that two vertices are adjacent if and only if the size of the intersection of their corresponding sets satisfies the certain rule. Precisely, let G be a finite simple graph with vertex set V and L be a subset of non-negative integers. A set intersection representation of G with respect to L, assign to every vertex $v \in V$ a finite set A_v, such that two vertices u and v are adjacent if and only if $|A_u \cap A_v| \in L$. The question we are interest in is the minimum size of the universe of the sets, $\cup_{v \in V} A_v$, used for a set intersection representation. This parameter is denoted by $\Theta_L(G)$ and called the *intersection dimension* of G with respect to L [4].

By considering different types of L, different intersection dimensions $\Theta_L(G)$ are defined. For instance, the intersection dimension with respect to $L = \{k, k+1, \dots\}$, for some integer

k, is called the *threshold k-dimension* and denoted by $\Theta_k(G)$. The *threshold dimension* of G is $\Theta_{\text{thr}}(G) = \min_k \Theta_k(G)$ over all integers k [4]. The *modular dimension* of G is $\Theta_{mod}(G) = \min_L \Theta_L(G)$ over all modular types of $L = \{l : l \pmod p \in R\}$, where $p \geq 2$ is a positive integer and $R \subseteq \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$ is the set of residues. When $p = 2$ and $R = \{1\}$, the modular dimension is called the *odd dimension* and denoted by $\Theta_{\text{odd}}(G)$ [3]. The *absolute dimension* of G is $\Theta(G) = \min_L \Theta_L(G)$ over all sets L of non-negative integers.

If all sets assigned to the vertices are of the same size, say k, then the representation is called the *k-uniform set intersection representation.* The *k-uniform intersection dimension* of G with respect to L, denoted by $\Theta_{L,k}(G)$, is the minimum size of the universe of the sets in all k-uniform intersection representations of graph G. As a natural extension, we can assume that the size of sets assign to the vertices are restricted to r different sizes in the set $K = \{k_1, k_2, \dots, k_r\}$. In this case, we denote the minimum size of the universe of the sets in all such representations with $\Theta_{L,K}(G)$.

For bipartite graph G with a fixed vertex partition $V = V_1 \cup V_2$, the definition can be modified by relaxing the condition inside the partition sets (since only by checking if two vertices belong to one set of partitions, we understand that they are not adjacent). Indeed, a *bipartite set intersection representation* of graph G with respect to L, for a given set $L \subseteq \{0, 1, 2, \dots\}$, assign to every vertex $v \in V$ a finite set A_v, such that two vertices u, v from different partite sets are adjacent if and only if $|A_u \cap A_v| \in L$. The relaxed measure of the intersection dimensions on different types of L are denoted by lower case theta, $\theta_L(G)$, $\theta_{\text{thr}}(G)$, $\theta_{\text{mod}}(G)$ and $\theta(G)$ [9].

The set intersection representation of graphs has a close relation to the extremal set theory which is one of the important field in combinatorics. In fact, every set intersection representation of a graph corresponds to a family of sets with a specific rule on the intersection of the sets and vice versa. This relation is a natural motivation to use the extremal set theory techniques in studying the different types of the intersection dimension.

If in a set intersection representation of G, same sets assign to different vertices u and v, then their set of neighbors should have differ in at most u and v. Two such vertices are called *twin vertices* and a graph without twin vertices is called a *twin-free* graph. It is easy to see that if H is a maximal twin-free induced subgraph of G, then $\Theta_L(H) \leq \Theta_L(G)$ and $\theta_L(H) = \theta_L(G)$, for every set L. Thus, every lower bound for the intersection dimension of H is a lower bound for the intersection dimension of G. Since in the set system corresponding to a set representation, different vertices require different sets of labels, through this paper we consider twin-free graphs with no isolated vertex.

The concept of the absolute dimension is in the connection with the problem of finding explicit lower bounds in the complexity theory [9, 15, 16]. For a twin-free graph G of order n, since no pair of vertices could be assigned the same set in a representation, we have $\Theta(G) \geq \log_2 n$ and $\theta(G) \geq \log_2 n$. Although, the question of finding an explicit construction for graph G such that $\Theta(G) \gg \log_2 n$ and $\theta(G) \gg \log_2 n$, in general seems very hard. With this motivation we are interest in finding lower bounds for the various intersection dimensions of graphs and exploring graphs with large intersection dimension with respect to different types of L.

A good summery on the known results on the intersection dimension is given in [9] (for more results in this subject see [1, 2, 3, 8]). Most studied problems in this concept are in the threshold type $k = 1$ which is known as the edge clique covering number. Also, the bipartite intersection dimension in the threshold type $k = 1$ correspond to the well-known parameter, the edge biclique covering number [10]. The bipartite intersection dimensions in various types are studied in [9] and the following results are proved.

A *Hadamard matrix* of order n is an $n \times n$ matrix with entries ± 1 and mutually orthogonal row vectors (over the $\mathbb{R}$). A graph associated with a Hadamard matrix, namely a *Hadamard graph*, of order n is a bipartite $n \times n$ graph H where two vertices are adjacent if and only if the corresponding entry of the Hadamard matrix is equal $+1$.

Theorem 1.1. [9]

a. *For every non-negative integer n, there exist a bipartite $n \times n$ graph G with $\theta(G) \geq (n-1)/2$.*

b. *For every Hadamard graph H of order n, both $\theta_{\text{thr}}(H)$ and $\theta_{\text{thr}}(H^c)$ are at least $\Omega(\sqrt{n})$.*

c. *For every bipartite graph G, $\theta_{\text{odd}}(G)$ is equal to the rank of the adjacency matrix of G over $\mathbb{Z}_2$.*

d. *Let p be a prime and R be a subset of residues module p with $|R| = s$. If $L = \{l : l \pmod{p} \in R\}$, then for every graph G of order n and maximum degree Δ,*

   (i) $\theta_L(G^c) \geq (n/\Delta)^{\frac{1}{s}}$.

   (ii) $\theta_L(G) \geq (\frac{1}{s} n/\Delta)^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$.

In this paper, we explore some lower bounds for the intersection dimension $\Theta_L(G)$ and $\theta_L(G)$ with respect to modular types, finite sets and k-threshold types L. First, in Section 2, we present some preliminaries that we need through the paper. In Section 3, we prove some lower bounds for $\Theta_L(G)$ in various types of L, such as modular types, finite types and threshold types in terms of the minimum rank of G; we conclude some graphs with large intersection dimension. Similar results are proved in Section 4 for the bipartite intersection dimension. In Section 5, we consider the uniform intersection set representation of graphs.

2 Preliminaries

In this section, we present some definitions and known results, which are necessary to prove our main theorems. We start with the definition of the rank of a graph.

Let $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F})$ be the set of all $n \times n$ matrices over a field $\mathbb{F}$ and $\mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$ be the subset of all symmetric matrices in $\mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F})$. For $A \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F})$, the graph of A, denoted by $\mathcal{G}(A)$, is a graph with vertex set $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ and edge set $\{ij : A_{ij} \neq 0 \text{ and } i \neq j\}$. Note that the diagonal of A is ignored in determining $\mathcal{G}(\mathcal{A})$.

The *minimum rank* [14] of a graph G over a field $\mathbb{F}$ is defined to be

$$\mathrm{mr}_{\mathbb{F}}(G) = \min\{\mathrm{rank}(A) : A \in \mathcal{S}_n(\mathbb{F}),\ \mathcal{G}(A) = G\}.$$

In the case of bipartite graph, for convenience we consider the bipartite adjacency matrix. The bipartite adjacency matrix of an $n \times n$ bipartite graph G with a vertex partition $V = V_1 \cup V_2$, denoted by $A_b(G)$, is a $(0, 1)$-matrix whose rows correspond to the vertices of V_1 and its columns correspond to the vertices of V_2, and the (i, j) entry of $A_b(G)$ is 1 if and only if vertex i is adjacent to vertex j. For $A \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F})$, the bipartite graph $\mathcal{G}_b(A)$ is a graph with bipartite set V_1 and V_2 corresponding to the rows and the columns of A, respectively, and edges $\{ij : A_{ij} \neq 0\}$.

The *bipartite minimum rank* of a bipartite graph G over a field $\mathbb{F}$ is defined to be

$$\mathrm{bmr}_{\mathbb{F}}(G) = \min\{\mathrm{rank}(A) : A \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{F}),\ \mathcal{G}_b(A) = G\}.$$

It can be easily seen that, for every bipartite graph G, $\mathrm{mr}_{\mathbb{F}}(G) = 2\mathrm{bmr}_{\mathbb{F}}(G)$. For convenience, when $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{R}$, we denote $\mathrm{mr}_{\mathbb{F}}(G)$ and $\mathrm{bmr}_{\mathbb{F}}(G)$ by $\mathrm{mr}(G)$ and $\mathrm{bmr}(G)$, also for $\mathbb{F} = \mathbb{Z}_p$ we denote them by $\mathrm{mr_p}(G)$ and $\mathrm{bmr_p}(G)$, respectively.

The following results are well-known and straightforward.

Proposition 1.2. *Over any field* $\mathbb{F}$*,*

a. if $G = \cup_{i=1}^{h} G_i$*, then* $\mathrm{mr}_{\mathbb{F}}(G) \leq \sum_{i=1}^{h} \mathrm{mr}_{\mathbb{F}}(G_i)$.

b. if G' *is an induced subgraph of* G*, then* $\mathrm{mr}_{\mathbb{F}}(G') \leq \mathrm{mr}_{\mathbb{F}}(G)$.

c. for the path P_n *on* n *vertices,* $\mathrm{mr}_{\mathbb{F}}(P_n) = n - 1$.

d. for the cycle C_n *on* n *vertices,* $\mathrm{mr}_{\mathbb{F}}(C_n) = n - 2$.

The following is a lower bound for the bipartite minimum rank of Hadamard graphs.

Theorem 2.2. [5] *If* H *is a Hadamard graph of order* n*, then* $\mathrm{bmr}(H) \geq \sqrt{n}$.

Regarding to the relation between the set intersection representation of graphs and set systems, the key tools in the proof of main theorems is the inclusion matrix of set systems.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ be two families of subsets of set $[l] = \{1, \ldots, l\}$. The $(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{T})$-*inclusion matrix*, denoted by $I(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{T})$ is a $(0, 1)$-matrix whose rows and columns are labeled by the members of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{T}$, respectively. The (F, T) entry of $I(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{T})$ will be 1 or 0 according to whether or not $T \subseteq F$. In the case that $\mathcal{T}$ is the family of all t-subsets of $[l] \cup \{0\}$, we denote the matrix by $I(\mathcal{F}, t)$ and call it the t-*inclusion matrix* of $\mathcal{F}$. When $\mathcal{F}$ is the family of all i-subsets of $[l] \cup \{0\}$, the corresponding t-inclusion matrix is denoted by $I(i, t)$. Let

$A_t(\mathcal{F},\mathcal{T}) = I(\mathcal{F},t) \times I(\mathcal{T},t)^T$, we call $A_t(\mathcal{F},\mathcal{T})$ the *t-intersection matrix* of $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{T}$ [6]. Indeed, $A_t(\mathcal{F},\mathcal{T})$ is a $|\mathcal{F}| \times |\mathcal{T}|$ matrix where its (F,T) entry is $\binom{|F\cap T|}{t}$. Moreover,

$$\operatorname{rank}(A_t(\mathcal{F},\mathcal{T})) \leq \operatorname{rank}(I(\mathcal{F},t)) \leq \binom{l}{t}.$$

The following fact is a useful relation in working with the inclusion matrix.

Proposition 3.2. [6] *If $\mathcal{F}$ is a subfamily of k-subsets of $[l] \cup \{0\}$, then*

$$I(\mathcal{F},i) \times I(i,t) = \binom{k-t}{i-t} I(\mathcal{F},t).$$

3 Lower bounds for the intersection dimension

In this section, we present some lower bounds for the intersection dimension of a graph G with respect to modular types, finite sets and k-threshold types L in terms of the minimum rank of G. Then, we conclude that graphs with large minimum rank could be the good candidates for graphs with large intersection dimension with respect to some specific types L.

Theorem 1.3. *Let p be a prime number and R be a subset of residues module p with $|R| = s$. If $L = \{l : l \pmod{p} \in R\}$, then for every graph G,*

(i) $\mathrm{mr_p}(G^c) \leq \displaystyle\sum_{t=0}^{s} \binom{\Theta_L(G)}{t}$.

(ii) $\mathrm{mr_p}(G) \leq \displaystyle\sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \binom{\Theta_L(G)}{t}$.

Proof. Assume that, $R = \{r_1, r_2, \ldots, r_s\}$ and $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_n\}$ is the family of sets assigned to the vertices of G in an optimal set representation with respect to L, i.e. $A_i \subseteq \{1, \ldots, \Theta_L(G)\}$. Let $M_t = A_t(\mathcal{A},\mathcal{A})$, $0 \leq t \leq s$, be the t-intersection matrix of the family $\mathcal{A}$. Remark that, M_t is an $n \times n$ matrix, with $\binom{|A_u \cap A_v|}{t}$ in the position (u,v), and

$$\operatorname{rank}(M_t) \leq \binom{\Theta_L(G)}{t}.$$

(i) First, we can choose a_t in $\mathbb{Z}_p$, $0 \leq t \leq s$, such that, for every non-negative integer x,

$$\prod_{t=1}^{s}(x - r_t) \equiv \sum_{t=0}^{s} a_t \binom{x}{t} \pmod{p}. \tag{1}$$

Then, we define an $n \times n$ matrix $M = \sum_{t=0}^{s} a_t M_t$. Thus by Relation (1), the (u,v) entry of M is equal to $\prod_{t=1}^{s}(|A_u \cap A_v| - r_t) \pmod{p}$. Therefore, M is a symmetric matrix such that for every $u \neq v$, its (u,v) entry is a multiple of p if and only if vertex u is adjacent to vertex v. Hence, over the field $\mathbb{Z}_p$,

$$\mathrm{mr_p}(G^c) \leq \mathrm{rank}(M).$$

On the other hand, by the definition of M, the row space of M is a subspace of the vector space spanned by the rows of M_t, $0 \leq t \leq s$, and consequently,

$$\mathrm{rank}(M) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{s} \mathrm{rank}(M_t) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{s} \binom{\Theta_L(G)}{t}.$$

Thus,

$$\mathrm{mr_p}(G^c) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{s} \binom{\Theta_L(G)}{t}.$$

(ii) Now we choose b_t^i in $\mathbb{Z}_p$, where $0 \leq t \leq p-1$ and $1 \leq i \leq s$, such that,

$$1 - (x - r_i)^{p-1} \equiv \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} b_t^i \binom{x}{t} \qquad \pmod{p}. \tag{2}$$

Then, we define an $n \times n$ matrix $M = \sum_{i=1}^{s} \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} b_t^i M_t$. Thus by Relation (2), the (u,v) entry of M is equal to $\sum_{i=1}^{s}[1 - (|A_u \cap A_v| - r_i)^{p-1}]$. Hence, by the Fermat's little theorem, for every two vertices u and v, the (u,v) entry of M is zero in $\mathbb{Z}_p$ if and only if vertex u is not adjacent to vertex v. Therefore, similar to above,

$$\mathrm{mr_p}(G) \leq \mathrm{rank}(M) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \mathrm{rank}(M_t) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \binom{\Theta_L(G)}{t}. \qquad \square$$

Using the following approximation for the binomial coefficients, we obtain lower bounds for $\Theta_L(G^c)$ and $\Theta_L(G)$ in terms of the minimum rank of G.

It can be seen that, for every positive integers $x, s > 1$, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{s} \binom{x}{i} \leq x^s. \tag{*}$$

Corollary 2.3. *Let p be a prime number and R be a subset of residues module p with $|R| = s$, where $s > 1$. If $L = \{l : l \pmod{p} \in R\}$, then for every graph G,*

(i) $\Theta_L(G^c) \geq (\mathrm{mr_p}(G))^{\frac{1}{s}}$.

(ii) $\Theta_L(G) \geq (\mathrm{mr_p}(G))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$.

Note that in the proof of part (i) in Theorem 1.3, if the coefficients a_t in Relations (1), and the matrices consider over the field $\mathbb{R}$, then with the similar argument the lower bound in terms of $\mathrm{mr}(G)$ for $\Theta_L(G^c)$, where L is a finite set, is obtained. Furthermore, by the Chebyshev's theorem, for every integer s, there is a prime number p, $s \leq p \leq 2s$. Thus, by Theorem 1.3 the lower bounds in terms of $\mathrm{mr_p}(G)$ for $\Theta_L(G)$, where L is finite set, are obtained. Hence, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 3.3. *If L is a finite set of size s, where $s > 1$, and $s \leq p \leq 2s$ be a prime number, then for every graph G,*

(i) $\Theta_L(G^c) \geq (\mathrm{mr}(G))^{\frac{1}{s}}$.

(ii) $\Theta_L(G^c) \geq (\mathrm{mr_p}(G))^{\frac{1}{s}}$.

(iii) $\Theta_L(G) \geq (\mathrm{mr_p}(G))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$.

By Proposition 1.2(a), $\Theta_1(G) \geq \mathrm{mr}(G)$, where $\Theta_1(G)$ is clique covering number of G. In the next corollary this is extended for all positive integer k. Since, $\Theta_L(G^c) = \Theta_{L^c}(G) = \Theta_k(G)$, where $L = \{0, 1, \ldots, k-1\}$, by Corollary 3.3(i) we get a lower bound for the $\Theta_k(G)$.

Corollary 4.3. *For every graph G and positive integer k,*

$$\Theta_k(G) \geq (\mathrm{mr}(G))^{\frac{1}{k}}.$$

Regarding to the obtained lower bounds in above, graphs with large minimum rank may be a desired graph with large intersection dimension.

In [2] using the Lovasz local lemma it was shown that, for every graph G with bounded maximum degree by a constant and every positive integer $k > 1$, $\Theta_k(G) \leq O(n^{\frac{1}{k}})$. Hence, by the above corollary, the order of $\Theta_k(G)$ for some family of graphs can be determined; particularly by part (c) and (d) of Proposition 1.2, $\Theta_k(G)$ for path and cycle is obtained. In [8], $\Theta_2(G)$ where G is a cycle or path is determined and proved that, $\Theta_2(P_n) \sim \sqrt{n}$ and $\Theta_2(C_n) \sim \sqrt{n}$.

Corollary 5.3. *If G is a graph of order n, maximum degree less than d and minimum rank of order n, then for every integer $k > 1$,*

$$\Theta_k(G) \sim n^{\frac{1}{k}}.$$

In particular, $\Theta_k(P_n) \sim n^{\frac{1}{k}}$ and $\Theta_k(C_n) \sim n^{\frac{1}{k}}$.

4 Lower bounds for the bipartite intersection dimension

This section deals with the bipartite intersection dimension of graphs with respect to modular types, finite types, threshold types L. Similar to the proof technique in Section 3, we define appropriate inclusion matrices and obtain lower bounds for $\theta_L(G)$ in terms of the bipartite minimum rank of G.

Theorem 1.4. *Let p be a prime and R be a subset of residues module p with $|R| = s$. If $L = \{l : l \pmod{p} \in R\}$, then for every bipartite graph G,*

(i) $\mathrm{bmr_p}(G^c) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{s} \binom{\theta_L(G)}{t}$.

(ii) $\mathrm{bmr_p}(G) \leq \displaystyle\sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \binom{\theta_L(G)}{t}$.

Proof. Suppose that, $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_n\}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{B_1, \ldots, B_n\}$ are the families of sets assigned to the vertices in two partition sets of G in a set representation by $\theta_L(G)$ labels. Let $M_t = A_t(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B})$ be the t-intersection matrix of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$. Now we follow the similar argument as in the proof of Theorem 1.3 and conclude that

(i) $\mathrm{bmr_p}(G^c) \leq \mathrm{rank}(M) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{s} \mathrm{rank}(M_t) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{s} \binom{\theta_L(G)}{t}$, where $M = \sum_{t=0}^{s} a_t M_t$ and a_t, $0 \leq t \leq s$, satisfy in Relation (1).

(ii) $\mathrm{bmr_p}(G) \leq \mathrm{rank}(M) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \mathrm{rank}(M_t) \leq \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} \binom{\theta_L(G)}{t}$, where $M = \sum_{i=1}^{s} \sum_{t=0}^{p-1} b_t^i M_t$ and b_t^i, $0 \leq t \leq p-1$ and $1 \leq i \leq s$, satisfy in Relation (2). ☐

It is known that for every bipartite graph G, $\theta_{\mathrm{odd}}(G) = \mathrm{mr}_{\mathbb{Z}_2}(G)$ (Theorem 1.1(c)). This shows that the above lower bounds are tight.

From Theorem 1.4, by the approximation (*) for the binomial coefficients, we get the following corollary.

Corollary 2.4. *Let p be a prime number and R be a subset of residues module p with $|R| = s$, where $s > 1$. If $L = \{l : l \pmod p \in R\}$, then for every bipartite graph G,*

(i) $\theta_L(G^c) \geq (\mathrm{bmr_p}(G))^{\frac{1}{s}}$.

(ii) $\theta_L(G) \geq (\mathrm{bmr_p}(G))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$.

By the above lower bounds we obtain an alternative proof of Theorem 1.1(d) as follows.

A bipartite $n \times n$ graph $G = (V_1 \cup V_2, E)$ is *increasing* if it is possible to enumerate its vertices $V_1 = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ and $V_2 = \{y_1, \ldots, y_n\}$ so that $x_i y_i \in E$ and $x_i y_j \notin E$ for all $i > j$. In [9] it is stated that every bipartite $n \times n$ graph G of maximum degree Δ, with no isolated vertices, contains an induced bipartite $(n/\Delta) \times (n/\Delta)$ increasing subgraph.

By Proposition 1.2(b), if H is the induced bipartite $(n/\Delta) \times (n/\Delta)$ increasing subgraph of G, then $\mathrm{bmr}_{\mathbb{F}}(G) \geq \mathrm{bmr}_{\mathbb{F}}(H)$. Moreover, the adjacency matrix of H is upper triangular with non-zero diagonal entry. Thus, $\mathrm{bmr}_{\mathbb{F}}(G) \geq n/\Delta$ over any field $\mathbb{F}$ and hence by Corollary 2.4 the lower bounds in Theorem 1.1(d) are obtained.

Since for every positive integer s, there is a prime number p, $s \leq p \leq 2s$, by Corollary 2.4, the following lower bounds for $\theta_L(G)$ with respect every to finite set L of size s is obtained.

Corollary 3.4. *If L is a finite set of size s, where $s > 1$, and $s \leq p \leq 2s$ be a prime number, then for every bipartite graph G,*

(i) $\theta_L(G^c) \geq (\mathrm{bmr}(G))^{\frac{1}{s}}$.

(ii) $\theta_L(G^c) \geq (\mathrm{bmr_p}(G))^{\frac{1}{s}}$.

(iii) $\theta_L(G) \geq (\mathrm{bmr_p}(G))^{\frac{1}{p-1}}$.

From the above corollary, we could get lower bounds of order n for some graphs. For example, by Theorem 2.2, Corollary 3.4 implies that for every Hadamard graph H of order n, with respect to every finite set L, we have $\theta_L(H^c) = \Omega(n)$.

Since, $\theta_L(G^c) = \theta_k(G)$, where $L = \{0, 1, \dots, k-1\}$, by Corollary 3.4(i) we get the next corollary.

Corollary 4.4. *If G is a bipartite graph, then for every positive integer $k > 1$,*

$$\theta_k(G) \geq (\mathrm{bmr}(G))^{\frac{1}{k}},$$

moreover $\theta_1(G) \geq \mathrm{bmr}(G) - 1$.

5 Uniform set intersection representation

In this section, we consider the set intersection representation of graphs in the uniform case and obtain the same lower bounds for $\Theta_{L,k}$ and $\Theta_{L,K}$ with respect to various types L.

Theorem 1.5. *Let p be a prime number and R be a subset of residues module p with $|R| = s$. If $L = \{l : l \pmod p \in R\}$, then for every graph G,*

$$\mathrm{mr_p}(G^c) \leq \binom{\Theta_{L,k}(G)}{s}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \dots, A_n\}$ be the k-uniform family of subsets assigned to the vertices of G by $\Theta_{L,k}$ labels. Suppose that $M_t = A_t(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A}) = I(\mathcal{A}, t)I(\mathcal{A}, t)^T$ be the t-intersection matrix of $\mathcal{A}$. Remind that, M_t is an $n \times n$ matrix, with $\binom{|A_u \cap A_v|}{t}$ in position (u, v).

By Proposition 3.2,

$$I(\mathcal{A}, s) \times I(s, t) = \binom{k-t}{s-t} I(\mathcal{A}, t).$$

Note that, the column vector space of M_t is a subspace of column vector space of $I(\mathcal{A}, t)$. Moreover, if $0 \leq t \leq s \leq k$, then $\binom{k-t}{s-t} \neq 0$. Thus, by the above relation, the column vector space of $I(\mathcal{A}, t)$ is a subspace of column vector space of $I(\mathcal{A}, s)$.

(i) We define an $n \times n$ matrix $M = \sum_{t=0}^{s} a_t M_t$ where a_t is in $\mathbb{Z}_p$, $0 \leq t \leq s$, satisfying in Relation (1). By the definition of M the column vector space of M is a subspace of the vector space spanned by the columns of M_t, $0 \leq t \leq s$, that is the subspace of the column vector space of $I(\mathcal{A}, s)$, therefore,

$$\mathrm{rank}(M) \leq \mathrm{rank}(I(\mathcal{A}, s)) \leq \binom{\Theta_{L,k}(G)}{s}.$$

On the other hand, by choosing a_t, M is a symmetric matrix such that for every $u \neq v$, its (u, v) entry is zero if and only if vertex u is adjacent to vertex v. Therefore, over the field $\mathbb{Z}_p$,

$$\mathrm{mr_p}(G^c) \leq \mathrm{rank}(M) \leq \binom{\Theta_{L,k}(G)}{s}.$$

□

The *Kneser graph* $K(n, k)$ is a graph with all k-subsets of $[n]$ as the vertex set such that two vertices are adjacent if and only if their corresponding sets are disjoint. It is well known that every graph is an induced subgraph of a Kneser graph with respect to some n and k. For a positive integer k, the least positive integer n such that G is an induced subgraph of $K(n, k)$ is called the *Kneser number* of G and denoted by $N(G, k)$ [7]. Indeed, for every twin-free graph G, $N(G, k) = \Theta_{L,k}(G)$, for $L = \{0\}$. Thus, a lower bound for the Kneser number of graphs in terms of the minimum rank is obtained.

Corollary 2.5. *For every graph G and positive integer k, $N(G, k) \geq \mathrm{mr}(G^c)$.*

A natural extension of the uniform representation is a set representation with the restriction on the size of sets to r different sizes. For such representation, in the next theorem a generalization of the results of Theorem 1.5 is proved.

Theorem 3.5. *If $L = \{l_1, \ldots, l_s\}$ and $K = \{k_1, \ldots, k_r\}$ are two subsets of non-negative integers, where $k_i > s - r$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, then for every graph G,*

$$\mathrm{mr}(G^c) \leq r \sum_{t=s-r+1}^{s} \binom{\Theta_{L,K}(G)}{t}.$$

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{A_1, \ldots, A_n\}$ be the family of sets assigned to the vertices of G with $\Theta_{L,K}(G)$ labels and $\mathcal{A}_i$, $1 \leq i \leq r$, be the k_i-uniform subfamily of subsets of $\mathcal{A}$. Suppose that $M_t = A_t(\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{A})$ be the t-intersection matrix of $\mathcal{A}$. We define matrix $M = \sum_{t=0}^{s} a_t M_t$, where a_t in $\mathbb{R}$, $0 \leq t \leq s$, satisfy in Relation (1).

For convenience, we denote the row and column vector spaces of a matrix Q by $R(Q)$ and $C(Q)$, respectively. By the definition of $M_t = I(\mathcal{A}, t) \times I(\mathcal{A}, t)^T$,

$$C(M_t) \subseteq C(I(\mathcal{A}, t)).$$

Moreover, by Proposition 3.2, we have,

$$I(\mathcal{A}_j, s - r + 1) \times I(s - r + 1, t) = \binom{k_j - t}{s - r + 1 - t} I(\mathcal{A}_j, t).$$

If $0 \leq t \leq s - r + 1$ then $t \leq s - r + 1 \leq k_j$ and $\binom{k_j - t}{s-r+1-t} \neq 0$. Hence, by the above equality, for $0 \leq t \leq s - r + 1$,

$$C(I(\mathcal{A}_j, t)) \subseteq C(I(\mathcal{A}_j, s - r + 1)).$$

Therefore, we have the following relations,

$$\begin{aligned} C(M) & \subseteq \textstyle\sum_{t=0}^{s} C(M_t) \subseteq \textstyle\sum_{t=0}^{s} C(I(\mathcal{A},t)) \\ & \subseteq \textstyle\sum_{t=0}^{s} \sum_{j=1}^{r} C(I(\mathcal{A}_j,t)) \\ & \subseteq \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{r} \sum_{t=s-r+1}^{s} C(I(\mathcal{A}_j,t)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{rank}(M) & \leq \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{r} \sum_{t=s-r+1}^{s} |C(I(\mathcal{A}_j,t))| \\ & \leq \textstyle\sum_{j=1}^{r} \sum_{t=s-r+1}^{s} \binom{\Theta_{L,K}(G)}{t} \\ & = r \textstyle\sum_{t=s-r+1}^{s} \binom{\Theta_{L,K}(G)}{t}. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by choosing a_i, M is a matrix such that for every u and v, its (u,v) entry is zero if and only if vertex u is adjacent to vertex v. Therefore, over field $\mathbb{R}$,

$$\operatorname{mr}(G^c) \leq \operatorname{rank}(M) \leq r \sum_{t=s-r+1}^{s} \binom{\Theta_L(G)}{t}.$$

$\square$

By the same argument as in Theorems 1.5 and 3.5, the same lower bounds proved for the bipartite intersection dimension can be obtained.

References

[1] N. Eaton. Intersection representation of complete unbalanced bipartite graphs. *J. Combin. Theory Ser. B*, 71(2):123–129, 1997.

[2] N. Eaton, R. J. Gould, and V. Rödl. On p-intersection representations. *J. Graph Theory*, 21(4):377–392, 1996.

[3] N. Eaton and D. A. Grable. Set intersection representations for almost all graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 23(3):309–320, 1996.

[4] N. Eaton and V. Rödl. Graphs of small dimensions. *Combinatorica*, 16(1):59–85, 1996.

[5] J. Forster. A linear lower bound on the unbounded error probabilistic communication complexity. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 65(4):612–625, 2002. Special issue on complexity, 2001 (Chicago, IL).

[6] P. Frankl and L. Babai. *Linear algebra methods in combinatorics.* 1992. Preliminary Version 2.

[7] P. Hamburger, A. Por, and M. Walsh. Kneser representations of graphs. *SIAM J. Discrete Math.*, 23(2):1071–1081, 2009.

[8] M. S. Jacobson, A. E. Kézdy, and D. B. West. The 2-intersection number of paths and bounded-degree trees. *J. Graph Theory*, 19(4):461–469, 1995.

[9] S. Jukna. On set intersection representations of graphs. *J. Graph Theory*, 61(1):55–75, 2009.

[10] S. Jukna and A. S. Kulikov. On covering graphs by complete bipartite subgraphs. *Discrete Math.*, 309(10):3399–3403, 2009.

[11] L. Lovász. On the Shannon capacity of a graph. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 25(1):1–7, 1979.

[12] L. Lovász and K. Vesztergombi. Geometric representations of graphs. In *Paul Erdős and his mathematics, II (Budapest, 1999)*, volume 11 of *Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud.*, pages 471–498. János Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest, 2002.

[13] T. D. Parsons and T. Pisanski. Vector representations of graphs. *Discrete Math.*, 78(1-2):143–154, 1989.

[14] S. Parter. On the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of a class of matrices. *J. Soc. Indust. Appl. Math.*, 8:376–388, 1960.

[15] P. Pudlák and V. Rödl. A combinatorial approach to complexity. *Combinatorica*, 12(2):221–226, 1992.

[16] A. A. Razborov. Applications of matrix methods to the theory of lower bounds in computational complexity. *Combinatorica*, 10(1):81–93, 1990.